## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Troy K. Scheffler,

Civ. No. 11-3279 (JNE/JJK)

Plaintiff,

٧.

Jack Molin, in his individual capacity acting under color of law as a Crystal Building Inspector, and City of Crystal, Minnesota.

ORDER

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery.

(Doc. No. 65.) On October 1, 2012, the Court held a hearing on the motion and the parties' counsel presented oral argument. Based on the motion, Defendants' response, the hearing, the record, and all the files and proceedings therein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery (Doc. No. 65), is GRANTED
   IN PART and DENIED IN PART as stated on the record and as set forth in this
   Order;
- 2. Plaintiff's motion is **GRANTED** to the extent Plaintiff seeks an unredacted copy of an investigation report. Defendants provided Plaintiff the unredacted copy at the hearing, and Plaintiff is bound by the limitations on the use of such information and its treatment as confidential that the Court imposed in its August 10, 2012 Order (Doc. No. 63 at 21–22);

CASE 0:11-cv-03279-JNE-JJK Document 82 Filed 10/01/12 Page 2 of 2

3. Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED AS MOOT** to the extent he requests

that Defendant Jack Molin be required to verify a response to all Plaintiff's

interrogatories. At the hearing, Plaintiff withdrew this request and represented

that he seeks no further relief;

4. Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED** to the extent that he seeks further

specificity in Defendants' response to Plaintiff's Interrogatory No. 2. Defendants

need not provide any further specificity concerning their affirmative defenses of

qualified immunity, official immunity, statutory immunity, and vicarious official

immunity;

5. Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED** to the extent he seeks documents

relating to two other incidents of disciplinary action taken by Defendant City of

Crystal against Defendant Jack Molin;

Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED** to the extent he asks the Court to enter 6.

an umbrella protective order:

7. Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED** to the extent he asks the Court to

modify the Scheduling Order to allow additional time for discovery.

Date: October 1, 2012

s/ Jeffrev J. Keves

United States Magistrate Judge

2